

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/816,980	04/02/2004	Ho-Yuan Yu	LOVO-56.DIV	2006
41066	7590 02/07/2006		EXAM	INER
	MURABITO & HAO,	NGO, NGAN V		
TWO NORTH MARKET STREET, THIRD FLOOR SAN JOSE, CA 95113			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SAN JOSE,	SAN 103E, CA 93113		2818	
			DATE MAILED: 02/07/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

5/

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/816,980	YU, HO-YUAN				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Ngan Ngo	2818				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro	•				
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-10 and 21-30 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-10 and 21-30 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 10/816,980

Art Unit: 2818

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the "MOSFET" in claims 4 and 24 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Page 2

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the

Application/Control Number: 10/816,980

Art Unit: 2818

applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 2, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wensley et al (US 6,566,227 B2).

Wensley discloses an electronic silicon device comprising a silicon substrate (112), a trench disposed in the planar surface of the silicon substrate having a wall and a bottom, a silicon dioxide layer (115) formed on the bottom and the wall of the trench and being terminated at a distance below the planar surface of the silicon device, and a polysilicon (116) disposed on the surface of the silicon dioxide layer and on a portion of the wall.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3-10 and 23-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wensley et al (US 6,566,227 B2) in view of Cogan et al (4,835,586).

Wensley discloses all the subject matter discussed above; Cogan further teaches that JFET, MOSFET, and integrated circuit can be formed in the silicon substrate. Note figures 5 and 6 of Cogan. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to form the JFET, MOSFET, and integrated circuit in Wensley's silicon substrate in order to make useful electronic silicon device.

In re claim 6 and 26, the trench in Cogan is formed above the gate (116a).

Page 4

In re claims 9, 10, 29 and 30, no patentable weight is given to the process of making the silicon device. A "product by process" claim is directed to the product per se, no matter how actually made, In re Hirao, 190 USPQ 15 at 17(footnote 3). See also In re Brown, 173 USPQ 685; In re Luck, 177 USPQ 523; In re Fessmann, 180 USPQ 324; In re Avery, 186 USPQ 161; In re Wertheim, 191 USPQ 90 (209 USPQ 554 does not deal with this issue); In re Marosi et al, 218 USPQ 289; and particularly In re Thorpe, 227 USPQ 964, all of which make it clear that it is the patentability of the final product per se which must be determined in a "product by process" claim, and not the patentability of the process, and that an old or obvious product produced by a new method is not patentable as a product, whether claimed in "product by process" claims or not. Note that applicant has the burden of proof in such cases, as the above caselaw makes clear.

The other references are cited to show other structures pertinent to Applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Examiner Ngan Ngo at telephone number (571) 272-1711. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571)-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

Application/Control Number: 10/816,980

Art Unit: 2818

Page 5

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

my 1 m

Ngan Van Ngo Primary Examiner

Ngan Ngo

February 3, 2006